arXiv:cond-mat/0005159v1 9 May 2000

Analytical results for a trapped, weakly-interacting Bose-Einstein condensate under rotation

A. D. Jackson[1] and G. M. Kavoulakis[2]
[1]*Niels Bohr Institute, Blegdamsvej 17, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark,*
[2]*NORDITA, Blegdamsvej 17, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark*

(February 1, 2008)

We examine the problem of a repulsive, weakly-interacting and harmonically trapped Bose-Einstein condensate under rotation. We derive a simple analytic expression for the energy incorporating the interactions when the angular momentum per particle is between zero and one and find that the interaction energy decreases linearly as a function of the angular momentum in agreement with previous numerical and limiting analytical studies.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Fi, 05.30.Jp, 67.40.Db, 67.40.Vs

One of the questions that followed the experimental realization of Bose-Einstein condensation [1] in vapours of alkali atoms [2] is how they behave under rotation. The experimental observation of vortex states in a two-component system has been reported by Matthews *et al.* [3], and the existence of vortex states in a stirred one-component Bose-Einstein condensate has been demonstrated by Madison *et al.* [4]. Theoretical studies have also addressed this problem both in the Thomas-Fermi limit of strong interactions between the atoms [5–7] and in the limit of weak interactions [8–13].

In the limit of weak interactions and for a given angular momentum L, there is a large degeneracy corresponding to the ways of distributing L units of angular momentum among N harmonically confined atoms. Diagonalizing the interaction within this space of degenerate states, Bertsch and Papenbrock [11] determined the ground state energy numerically for a limited number of particles and an effective repulsive interaction between them; the same method can evidently provide the complete excitation spectrum of the system. One remarkable observation is that, for $2 \le L \le N$, the ground-state energy appears to have a particularly simple form with an interaction energy which decreases linearly with L. This result has also been obtained analytically in Ref. [12] in the region $L \lesssim N$ with use of a Bogoliubov transformation, and it is also in agreement with the study of this problem using the mean-field approximation [9,12].

Here, we present an analytic derivation of this linear dependence of the ground state energy on L. Our starting point is the hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}$, where

$$\hat{H}_0 = \sum_i -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M}\boldsymbol{\nabla}_i^2 + \sum_i \frac{1}{2}M\omega^2 r_i^2 \tag{1}$$

includes the kinetic energy of the particles and the potential energy due to the trapping potential, and

$$\hat{V} = \frac{1}{2}U_0 \sum_{i \neq j} \delta(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j) \tag{2}$$

is the interaction energy, which we assume to be a contact interaction. Here, M is the mass of the atoms, ω is the frequency of the trapping potential, which is assumed to be isotropic, and $U_0 = 4\pi\hbar^2 a/M$ is the strength of the effective two-body interaction, with a being the scattering length for atom-atom collisions. We assume that $a > 0$, i.e., we treat only the case of repulsive interactions between the atoms. Further, we restrict our attention to the domain

$$nU_0 \ll \hbar\omega, \tag{3}$$

where n is the density of the condensed atoms. If the system has angular momentum L, this condition allows us to work within the subspace of states which are degenerate in the absence of interactions. All other states differ by an energy of order $\hbar\omega$, which is much larger than nU_0 by assumption.

It is convenient to work in the basis

$$|N_0, N_1, N_2, ...\rangle \equiv |0^{N_0}, 1^{N_1}, 2^{N_2}, ...\rangle, \tag{4}$$

where N_k is the number of particles with angular momentum $\hbar k$. These occupation numbers must be chosen to respect the obvious constraints on particle number and angular momentum:

$$\sum_k N_k = N; \quad \sum_k k N_k = L. \tag{5}$$

We introduce annihilation and creation operators a_k and $a_k^\dagger$, which destroy or create one particle with angular momentum $\hbar k$. The number operator $\hat{N}$ and the angular-momentum operator $\hat{L}$ can then be expressed as

$$\hat{N} = \sum_k a_k^\dagger a_k; \; \hat{L} = \sum_k \hbar k a_k^\dagger a_k. \tag{6}$$

We also introduce the raising and lowering operators, $\hat{L}_\pm$, as

$$\hat{L}_+ = \sum_k \sqrt{k+1}\, a_{k+1}^\dagger a_k; \; \hat{L}_- = \sum_k \sqrt{k+1}\, a_k^\dagger a_{k+1}. \tag{7}$$

Finally, we write the interaction $\hat{V}$, Eq. (2), as

$$\hat{V} = \frac{U_0}{2} \sum_K \left(\sum_{k'=0}^{K} \frac{a^\dagger_{k'}}{\sqrt{I_{k'}}} \frac{a^\dagger_{K-k'}}{\sqrt{I_{K-k'}}} \right) J_K \times \left(\sum_{k=0}^{K} \frac{a_k}{\sqrt{I_k}} \frac{a_{K-k}}{\sqrt{I_{K-k}}} \right) , \quad (8)$$

where $I_k = k!$ and $J_K = K!/2^K$. It is readily seen that

$$[\hat{L}, \hat{L}_\pm] = \hat{L}_\pm , \quad (9)$$

which shows that the operators $\hat{L}_\pm$ raise or lower the angular momentum by one unit when applied to the states of Eq. (4). Further, both the interaction, $\hat{V}$, and the hamiltonian commute with $\hat{L}_\pm$,

$$[\hat{V}, \hat{L}_\pm] = [\hat{H}, \hat{L}_\pm] = 0. \quad (10)$$

This shows that, if $|L, N\rangle$ is an eigenstate of $\hat{V}$ with eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{L,N}$, the state $\hat{L}_+|L, N\rangle$ will also be an eigenstate of $\hat{V}$ with the same eigenenergy but with $L + 1$ units of angular momentum.

We now proceed to the demonstration that the spectrum is indeed linear if $L \leq N$. For any given eigenstate with a given N and L, the repeated application of $\hat{L}_+$ will generate infinitely many new eigenstates with angular momenta $L+1, L+2, ...$ These states are obtained by adding angular momentum to the center of mass coordinate [8,10,14] while leaving the wavefunction unchanged in the relative coordinates of the particles. Since the interaction energy depends only on relative coordinates and since the center of mass variables separate for a harmonic potential, the interaction energy is the same for each of these states. For any given N and L, it is useful to pay special attention to those “intrinsic” eigenstates, $|L, N\rangle_{\rm int}$, which do not have any center of mass excitation. The observation that the interaction energy in the ground state decreases with increasing L [11] indicates that the ground state wavefunction is an intrinsic state. When $\hat{L}_+$ acts on any eigenstate $|L-1, N\rangle$ (i.e., intrinsic or not), it creates a state $|L, N\rangle$ with center of mass excitation. Such states are necessarily orthogonal to intrinsic states with angular momentum L, and thus

$${}_{\rm int}\langle L, N|\hat{L}_+|L-1, N\rangle = \langle L-1, N|\hat{L}_-|L, N\rangle_{\rm int} = 0. \quad (11)$$

Since the states $|L-1, N\rangle$ form a complete set with angular moment $L-1$, we conclude from Eq. (11) that

$$\hat{L}_-|L, N\rangle_{\rm int} = 0. \quad (12)$$

Let us now consider two particular basis states, $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$, for any $L < N$ in the occupation number representation of Eq. (4),

$$|A\rangle = |N-L+1, L-2, 1\rangle; \ |B\rangle = |N-L, L, 0\rangle. \quad (13)$$

States $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$ are not eigenstates of $\hat{V}$ but will in general be components of these eigenstates. Similarly, consider the state $|C\rangle$

$$|C\rangle = |N-L+1, L-1, 0\rangle. \quad (14)$$

Note that these three states have $N_k = 0$ for all $k \geq 3$. Under the action of $\hat{L}_-$, $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$ are the only states which can lead to state $|C\rangle$. Therefore, if an intrinsic eigenstate $|L, N\rangle_{\rm int}$ includes these basis states in the combination $\alpha|A\rangle + \beta|B\rangle$, we see from Eq. (12) that

$$\hat{L}_-(\alpha|A\rangle + \beta|B\rangle) \propto |C\rangle = 0. \quad (15)$$

We can satisfy Eq. (15) either by choosing $\alpha = \beta = 0$ or by insisting that

$$\frac{\beta}{\alpha} = -\left(\frac{2(L-1)}{L(N-L+1)} \right)^{1/2} . \quad (16)$$

The second option is interesting since it uniquely determines the ratio of two components in $|L, N\rangle_{\rm int}$.

Since the state $|L, N\rangle_{\rm int}$ is an eigenstate of $\hat{V}$, it follows that

$$\langle B|\hat{V}|L, N\rangle_{\rm int} = \mathcal{E}_{L,N}\langle B|L, N\rangle_{\rm int}. \quad (17)$$

However, the only component of the state $|L, N\rangle_{\rm int}$ which can be connected to state $|B\rangle$ by the interaction $\hat{V}$ is precisely the linear superposition $\alpha|A\rangle + \beta|B\rangle$. Since the ratio β/α is known, this fact can be used to determine the eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{L,N}$. Since $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$ involve particles with $k = 0,\ 1$, and 2 only, the relevant part of the interaction $\hat{V}$ is thus

$$\hat{V} = \frac{1}{2}U_0(a^\dagger_0 a^\dagger_0 a_0 a_0 + 2a^\dagger_1 a^\dagger_0 a_1 a_0 + \frac{1}{2}a^\dagger_1 a^\dagger_1 a_1 a_1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}a^\dagger_1 a^\dagger_1 a_2 a_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}a^\dagger_2 a^\dagger_0 a_1 a_1). \quad (18)$$

The required matrix elements are

$$\frac{\beta}{2}\langle B|\, a^\dagger_0 a^\dagger_0 a_0 a_0 + 2a^\dagger_1 a^\dagger_0 a_1 a_0 + \frac{1}{2}a^\dagger_1 a^\dagger_1 a_1 a_1 |B\rangle = \frac{\beta}{2}[(N-L)(N-L-1) + 2L(N-L) + \frac{1}{2}L(L-1)], \quad (19)$$

and

$$\frac{\alpha}{2\sqrt{2}}\langle B|\, a^\dagger_1 a^\dagger_1 a_2 a_0 |A\rangle = \frac{\alpha}{2\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{(N-L-1)(L-1)L}. \quad (20)$$

It now follows directly from Eqs. (16), (17), (19), and (20) that

$$\mathcal{E}_{L,N} = \frac{N(2N-L-2)}{4}v_0, \quad (21)$$

in agreement with the numerical results of Refs. [11,12]. Here $v_0 = U_0 \int |\Phi_0(\mathbf{r})|^4 \, d\mathbf{r}$, and Φ_0 is the ground state wavefunction of the harmonic oscillator. To be precise, we have demonstrated that an intrinsic eigenstate *either* has the eigenvalue Eq. (21) *or* does not contain the components $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$. Completeness indicates that at least one intrinsic eigenstate with eigenvalue given by Eq. (21) must exist.

As we mentioned earlier, the interaction energy of Eq. (21) varies linearly with L for the contact two-body potential of Eq. (2). This feature is more general. As long as one deals with a two-body potential that conserves the angular momentum and commutes with $\hat{L}_{\pm}$, this linearity persists, with the slope $\partial \mathcal{E}_{L,N}/\partial L$ being dependent on the specific form of the interaction.

We have exploited the special features of harmonically trapped, weakly interacting bosons to determine a single eigenvalue of $\hat{V}$ from the properties of two (in general exponentially small) components of the wavefunction. The present elementary argument does not enable us to construct the full eigenfunction or to demonstrate that this eigenstate describes the ground state of the system. While the present method can be applied to other choices of $\hat{V}$, there appears to be no simple generalization to the interesting case $L > N$.

We thank B. Mottelson, C. J. Pethick and S. M. Reimann for helpful discussions. G.M.K. was supported by the European Commission, TMR program, contract No. ERBFMBICT 983142. G.M.K. would like to thank the Foundation of Research and Technology, Hellas (FORTH) for its hospitality.

---

[1] A. Griffin, D. W. Snoke, and S. Stringari (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1995).
[2] F. Dalfovo, S. Giorgini, L. P. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 463 (1999).
[3] M. R. Matthews, B. P. Anderson, P. C. Haljan, D. S. Hall, C. E. Wieman, and E. A. Cornell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2498 (1999).
[4] K. W. Madison, F. Chevy, W. Wohlleben, and J. Dalibard, e-print cond-mat/9912015.
[5] D. S. Rokhsar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2164 (1997).
[6] M. Linn, and A. L. Fetter, e-print cond-mat/9906139.
[7] D. L. Feder, C. W. Clark, and B. I. Schneider, e-print cond-mat/9910288; e-print cond-mat/9904269.
[8] N. K. Wilkin, J. M. F. Gunn, and R. A. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2265 (1998).
[9] D. A. Butts, and D. S. Rokhsar, Nature **397**, 327 (1999).
[10] B. Mottelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2695 (1999).
[11] G. F. Bertsch, and T. Papenbrock, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 5412 (1999).
[12] G. M. Kavoulakis, B. Mottelson, and C. J. Pethick, e-print cond-mat/0004307.
[13] A. D. Jackson, G. M. Kavoulakis, B. Mottelson, and S. Reimann, e-print cond-mat/0004309.
[14] S. A. Trugman and S. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 5280 (1985).